

10/803,012

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the analysis contained in the Official Action dated May 2, 2007.

Claim 10 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Danjell '388. The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised anticipatory rejection in view of the following remarks.

The present application relates to and teaches the use of a single piece of transparent material which has cavities defining alpha-numeric characters inlaid into it (e.g., a router is presently being used to form the cavities) with luminescent epoxy filling the cavities.

The applied Danjell '388 reference relates to and specifically teaches the use of *multiple layers*:

1. Layer 2 is a clear substrate panel;
2. A reverse print (negative) layer;
3. A reflecting layer 12;
4. A light absorbing layer 13; and
5. An overcut mat 14 filled with a luminescent casting material.

In the Examiner's analysis, the Examiner states that when the claims are given their "broadest reasonable interpretation", Danjell '388 has a "one piece body". It was not the Applicant's intention to have such a broad interpretation. In view of the raised rejection, the claims under consideration have, therefore, been amended to specify the one piece body is in the form of a sign plate made from a single layer of transparent material. It is respectfully submitted that claim 10, as amended, now clearly distinguishes over the Danjell '388 reference which is directed to multiple layers.

Next, claim 15 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons noted in the official action. Rejected claim 15 is accordingly amended, by the above claim amendments, and all of the presently pending claims are now believed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention, thereby overcoming all of the raised § 112, second paragraph, rejections. The entered claim amendments are directed solely at overcoming the raised indefiniteness rejection(s) and are not directed at distinguishing the present invention from the art of record in this case.

08/01/2007 11:28 AM

- 5 -

10/803,012

The Examiner indicates that claim 15 was indefinite since there were a number of alternative interpretations as to the manner in which the plate is back lit. In view of this, claim 15 is amended to specify that "the at least one inlaid cavity of the sign plate" is backlit by the light.

Lastly, claim 15 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Danjell '388 in view of either Logan, Jr. et al. '208 or Pregel et al. '462. The Applicant acknowledges and respectfully traverses the raised obviousness rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Applicant accepts the Examiner's analysis regarding substitution of the word "exit" for the word "glow". Nevertheless, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15, as amended to specify a sign plate made from a single layer of transparent material having at least one inlaid cavity, adequately distinguishes over the Danjell '388 reference which specifically relates to its multiple layers.

The Applicant acknowledges that the additional references of Logan, Jr. et al. '208 and Pregel et al. '462 may arguably relate to the feature(s) indicated by the Examiner in the official action. Nevertheless, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the base reference of Danjell '388 with this additional art of Logan, Jr. et al. '208 and Pregel et al. '462 still fail to in any way teach, suggest or disclose the above distinguishing features of the presently claimed invention. As such, all of the raised rejections should be withdrawn at this time in view of the above amendments and remarks.

Moreover, as there does not appear to be any teaching, suggestion or motivation in any of the applied art to alter the multiple layer configuration of Danjell '388 to be a single layer sign plate manufactured from a single layer of a transparent material, as presently claimed, withdrawal of all of the raised rejections in view of Danjell '388, either alone or in combination with either Logan, Jr. et al. '208 and/or Pregel et al. '462, is now believed to be in order.

If any further amendment to this application is believed necessary to advance prosecution and place this case in allowable form, the Examiner is courteously solicited to contact the undersigned representative of the Applicant to discuss the same.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn at this time. If the Examiner disagrees with the

08/01/2007 11:22 AM

- 6 -

10/803,012


Applicant's view concerning the withdrawal of the outstanding rejection(s) or applicability of the Danjell '388, Logan, Jr. et al. '208 and/or Pregel et al. '462 references, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the specific passage or passages, or the drawing or drawings, which contain the necessary teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure required by case law. As such teaching, suggestion and/or disclosure is not present in the applied references, the raised rejection should be withdrawn at this time. Alternatively, if the Examiner is relying on his/her expertise in this field, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter an affidavit substantiating the Examiner's position so that suitable contradictory evidence can be entered in this case by the Applicant.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the raised rejection(s) should be withdrawn and this application is now placed in a condition for allowance. Action to that end, in the form of an early Notice of Allowance, is courteously solicited by the Applicant at this time.

The Applicant respectfully requests that any outstanding objection(s) or requirement(s), as to the form of this application, be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is indicated for this case.

In the event that there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge the same or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account (Account No. 04-0213).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Bujold, Reg. No. 32,018
Customer No. 020210
Davis Bujold & Daniels, P.L.L.C.
112 Pleasant Street
Concord, NH 03301-2931
Telephone 603-226-7490
Facsimile 603-226-7499
E-mail: patent@davisandbujold.com

8/1/07 11:20 AM

- 7 -